



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/574,314	06/22/2007	Fiona A. Harding	GC818-US	7119
7590 Kamrin T. MacKnight Genencor International, Inc. 925 Page Mill Road Palo Alto, CA 94304-1013			EXAMINER DIBRINO, MARIANNE NMN	
			ART UNIT 1644	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 12/29/2010	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/574,314

Applicant(s)

HARDING, FIONA A.

Examiner

MARIANNE DIBRINO

Art Unit

1644

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 March 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

REQUIREMENT FOR UNITY OF INVENTION

As provided in 37 CFR 1.475(a), an international application shall relate to one invention only or to a group of inventions so linked as to form a single general inventive concept ("requirement of unity of invention"). Where a group of inventions is claimed in an international application, the requirement of unity of invention shall be fulfilled only when there is a technical relationship among those inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding special technical features. The expression "special technical features" shall mean those technical features that define a contribution which each of the claimed inventions, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art.

The determination whether a group of inventions is so linked as to form a single general inventive concept shall be made without regard to whether the inventions are claimed in separate claims or as alternatives within a single claim. See 37 CFR 1.475(e).

1. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in response to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

I. Claims 1-6, drawn to a method for determining a T cell epitope of a protein.

II. Claims 7-16, drawn to method for reducing the immunogenicity of a protein or for producing a variant protein having reduced allergenicity.

The inventions listed as Groups I and II do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

Claims 1, 7 and 12 of the instant application does not provide a technical feature that is distinguished over the prior art, as evidenced by WO 02/077187 A2 (of record) in view of admitted prior art on page 27 of the description at lines 20-25 (Walker and Wright., Neurosurg. Focus 13(6): 1-13, 2002).

WO 02/077187 A2 teaches producing altered proteins comprising a T cell epitope that is altered to make it non-immunogenic or less immunogenic. WO 02/077187 A2 further teaches that the alteration may occur by making amino acid substitutions to corresponding amino acid residues of a homolog of the protein of interest.

WO 02/077187 A2 teaches that the epitope may be determined by a method that comprises obtaining from a single blood source a solution of dendritic cells and a solution of naïve CD4+ and/or CD8+ T cells, promoting differentiation in said solution of dendritic cells, combining said solution of differentiated dendritic cells and naïve T cell with said protein, and measuring the T cell proliferation. WO 02/077187 A2 teaches that

instead of using the protein of interest in the said method, a series of peptide oligomers which correspond to all, *i.e.*, a pepset', or part of the protein of interest are used instead, and when the T cell epitope peptide is identified, an altered peptide may be created by altering the amino acid residues of the epitope until the peptide produces a different, reduce T cell response, or no response.

WO 02/077187 A2 does not teach production of altered BMP proteins, including BMP-7.

Admitted prior art Walker and Wright teach that BMP has been administered to assist in correcting spinal problems in certain patients; however, a significant proportion (about 38%) of these patients develop detectable anti-BMP antibodies, *i.e.*, they produce antibodies against a naturally occurring endogenous human protein.

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have produced altered BMP protein, including BMP-7 taught by the admitted prior art Walker and Wright, using the methodology taught by WO 02/077187 A2.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to do this in order to produce a form of BMP-7 that has reduced immunogenicity for use in the patients who produce antibodies against the native BMP protein.

Therefore, because claims 1, 7 and 12 do not provide a special technical feature, the instant invention lacks an inventive step and therefore lacks Unity of Invention.

2. This application contains claims directed or generic to the following patentably distinct species:

- a. one of SEQ ID NO: 1-8, and
- b. one of BMP-7 or BMP-14.

The species are independent or distinct because they are different sequences. In addition, these species are not obvious variants of each other based on the current record.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species, or a single grouping of patentably indistinct species, for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

There is a search and/or examination burden for the patentably distinct species as set forth above because at least the following reason(s) apply: the different SEQ ID NO each require a separate search against protein databases, and the two forms of BMP require employing different search strings and are two different proteins having different amino acid sequences.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or a grouping of patentably indistinct species to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected species or grouping of patentably indistinct species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

The election may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the election of species requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, Applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected species or grouping of patentably indistinct species.

Should Applicant traverse on the ground that the species, or groupings of patentably indistinct species from which election is required, are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing them to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the Examiner finds one of the species unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other species.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, Applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141.

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Marianne DiBrino whose telephone number is 571-272-0842. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Ram Shukla, can be reached on 571-272-0735. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/574,314
Art Unit: 1644

Page 5

Marianne DiBrino, Ph.D.
Patent Examiner
Group 1640
Technology Center 1600

/Michael Szperka/
Examiner, Art Unit 1644